

Remarks

In the subject Action, the Examiner rejected claims 9-10 under 35 U.S.C. 112. Each of these claims has been amended to clearly recite an apparatus as opposed to a method.

Next, the Examiner rejected claims 7-8 under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by the cited patent to Rodgers. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection and requests reconsideration in view of the foregoing amendments and the reasons set forth below.

Claim 7 has been amended to emphasize that the spring is interconnected between the first pulley and the second pulley to bias the first pulley toward a particular orientation relative to the second pulley. No such arrangement is taught or suggested by the Rodgers reference. Each of the Rodgers springs 204 simply biases a respective foot support 202 relative to a respective skate 104, and thus, has no effect on the Rodgers pulleys 108-109.

Claim 8, which depends from claim 7, has been amended to emphasize that the second spring is interconnected between the base and the one said pulley to bias the one said pulley toward a particular orientation relative to the base. Again, no such arrangement is taught or suggested by the Rodgers reference.

Next, the Examiner rejected claims 1-2 and 9-10 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Rodgers patent in view of the cited patent to Garcia. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection and requests reconsideration in view of the foregoing amendments and the reasons set forth below.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite an adjustable biasing means, common to each said foot support, for biasing each said foot support to move through a skiing path of motion in one mode of operation by requiring relatively less user imposed horizontal force to move each said skate, and relatively more user imposed vertical force to pivot each said foot support, and for alternatively biasing each said foot support to move through a stepping path of motion in another mode of operation by requiring relatively more user imposed horizontal force to move each said skate, and relatively less user imposed vertical force to pivot each said foot support. Neither cited reference teaches nor suggests how to apply common resistance to movement of left and right foot supports relative to respective skates that, in turn, move relative to one another.

Claim 2 has been amended to recite an adjustable resistance means for simultaneously adjusting a common resistance to movement of each said foot support relative to a respective link, and for adjusting resistance to movement of each said link relative to the base. Again, neither cited reference teaches nor suggests how to apply common resistance to movement of left and right foot supports that are movably mounted on respective left and right skates.

Finally, the Examiner rejected the pending claims under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting. In view of the foregoing amendments to the claims, Applicant respectfully asks that these rejections be reconsidered.

Having addressed the issues raised in the subject Action, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-2 and 7-10. In the event that any issues remain unresolved, the Examiner is always welcome to contact Applicant's undersigned representative to discuss such issues over the telephone.

Respectfully submitted,

MAK
Mark A. Krull
Reg. No. 34,205

(541) 385-0383